THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 2.] THURSDAY JULY 4, 1918. [No. 11.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.
Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam*.

A Vision Of India.

THE GODAVARI—II.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

To Sita seated radiant, glad, and proud
In Pushpak car which Rama's conquering arms
Had won to shrine his queen's imperial charms
He said: "Thy golden head which sorrow bowed
Before now raise. Upon thy vision crowd
No more red war's appalling fierce alarms.
And safe from life's successive shocks of harms
You shine like moon set free from hiding cloud.
Our holy land is now beneath our eyes
With all her wondrous wealth of bloom and fruit.
And here Godavari's full-breasted grace
Doth bring before our eyes all paradise,
And our remembered raptures hold me mute
With recollected bliss of other days."

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 4. JULY, 1918.

"A relatively harmless person."

We are glad that the Government has found out that Sir Subramania Iyer is "a relatively harmless person" and does not want to "turn him into a political martyr" by taking strong action against him for his letter to President Wilson. They are also conscious of "the danger of arousing agitation when such was extremely undesirable." Hence they have contented themselves with only "warning him that any repetition of such conduct would not again be passed over." We are also informed that Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford, when at Madras, had already administered to him "a severe reprimand" for his venturing to write to President Wilson.

All's well that ends well, but we think that the Secretary of State and the Viceroy should not have re-opened the subject after having once administered the "severe reprimand" they did while staying at Madras. We think that it was the howlings of the Anglo-Indian press that induced them to reconsider the matter. It is this tendency in Indian authorities to adjust and re-adjust themselves to the varying phases of Anglo-Indian opinion and Anglo-Indian self-love that breeds discontent in India. It is the voice of the Indian people and their true interests that they should regard with attention and sympathy in carrying on the Indian administration. Of this we have not much hope so long as the civilian bureaucracy continues the arbiter of India's destinies. Whatever may be the prevailing or proper view regarding the propriety or necessity of the step taken by Sir Subramania Iyer in writing to President Wilson and however reprehensible the strength of some of the language he used in it, Indians at large are unable to disguise the fact that, *in the main*, his views regarding the existing system of administration coincide with those held by all discerning Indians throughout the length and breadth of India. We have already pointed out that he would never have written this letter, if the Hotcheners—who resided in the Theosophical camp for foreigners at Adyar and had become preternaturally incensed, like Sir Subramania Iyer himself, at the action taken against their Theosophical idol by the Madras Government—had not come forward as messengers ready to go to America in order to deliver the letter to their great fellow-citizen, the President of the United States. The Hotcheners had never been known to sympathise with, or partake in, Indian political agitation. In fact, few even of Indian theosophists of prominence had actively taken part in our national movement for several years previously—not even Sir Subramania Iyer himself. It was the sudden and startling appearance or induction of Mrs. Besant into the Indian Movement for Home Rule that brought about the transformation of the theosophical mind at large. We only state facts, and do not wish to blame anybody for undergoing a change so desirable. The Hotcheners were American citizens, and their willingness to act as messen-

gers gave the opportunity to those who want to do a good turn to the cause which Mrs. Besant had enthusiastically taken up and to Mrs. Besant herself against whom the Madras Government had struck an unmerited blow in decreeing her internment much to the chagrin and sorrow of theosophists and also to the irritation, natural in all Indian politicians whose country's cause she had, for whatever reasons and however tardily, espoused. Had it not been for these strange Adyar residents from America, Sir Subramania Iyer would never have taken this curious step of writing to President Wilson, and all these consequences of it would not have arisen. Anyhow, India has derived some advantage at least out of this transaction of apparently doubtful wisdom or propriety, and indeed Providence often works in ways we are not able to foresee or answer for. Neither Mr. Montagu nor Lord Chelmsford can be unaware of this great truth and mystery of life.

We do not know what Sir Subramania Iyer will do when he has received, as we believe he has, the "warning that any repetition of such conduct would not again be passed over." He has often come forward to declare that he is prepared to suffer for his country's cause. Though we do not consider that he has yet done nothing which can be described as an act involving personal suffering or sacrifices of a serious kind, we are not prepared to say that he will not be capable of aspiring after, or accomplishing, such an act. We do not think that his resigning of the titles and decorations conferred on him by the Government is such an act, and we have given our reasons elsewhere in this issue. If he should resolve to make some stupendous sacrifice, then of course we shall, in common with the rest of India, hail him as a martyr and a patriot of the first order. But, as matters are, the honours of Indian political martyrdom rest with Mr. Tilak. A true prince of men, a scholar of unmatched power and learning, one devoted to the cause of his country from his early youth and who served the cause of national education as one of the founders and professors of the Fergusson College and thereby set an example of disinterestedness to his countrymen in other parts of India, the founder of various movements to promote the cause of Hindu religion in ways suited to the times we live in, the fearless expounder of Indian national ideals,—Mr. Tilak is a true hero of modern India, and the halo of martyrdom has gathered round him slowly owing to the persecutions and punishments inflicted on him over and over him again and the sufferings he has undergone in consequence, though without the least shrinking or quailing of spirit and only becoming more hardened and hardier than ever thereby and returning to the service of his country more ardent and diligent than ever before. Sir Subramania Iyer's declaration sometime back that he is prepared to suffer in the service of his country is certainly worthy of the spirit which ought to animate, and has animated, all great patriots and heroes everywhere. Such a lofty and disinterested patriotism as that of Mr. Tilak will ever be cherished in the hearts of all his countrymen for all time.

We think, however, the Government have acted wisely in resolving not to do anything further than what

they have done already. They give three reasons for taking this course. *First*, there is no "direct evidence" to show that Sir Subramania Iyer published his letter to President Wilson in the Indian papers. *Secondly*, it is undesirable "to do anything which might turn a relatively harmless person into a political martyr." *Thirdly*, there is "the danger of arousing agitation when such was extremely undesirable." We wish very much that Government will bear always in mind the principles contained in the second and third of these reasons. We have frequently pointed out that the Madras Government is chiefly responsible for the present political position which Mrs. Besant occupies in the land. She owes her Congress Presidency chiefly to her internment of three months and to the honour of martyrdom which it was the means of conferring on her. Sir Subramania Iyer is certainly one who has always occupied a much higher place than Mrs. Besant in the thoughts of the people of our Presidency. Still, no one has hitherto thought of him as a possible candidate for the honours of Indian martyrology. If the Government resolve to subject him to persecution of any kind and degree whatsoever, that would at once raise him to the highest place in our list of political martyrs and make him almost the most divinely endowed or inspired of all. There are numerous people about who are prepared to do the exact opposite of that which Government resolves to do and they will proceed to glorify him whom Government calls a "relatively harmless person" into a national hero. Let us hope that the incident will be closed, and that all will recognise that very little political capital can be made of it. The London Correspondent of *The Hindu* has pointed out that Sir Subramania Iyer's "misplaced pronouncements" in his letter to President Wilson are "felt to be embarrassing by many whose devotion to India's cause cannot be questioned" and that "the moment chosen for this particular intervention was unfortunate." Let us bear these circumstances in mind, and shape our future course accordingly. The best way to advance our country's cause is to keep our heads cool and our hearts warm, and to gain the good will of all by promoting Indian unity and strength.

Federalism as the Irish Solution.

Now that the War Cabinet has perpetrated a woeful blunder over the Irish question, and the policy of granting Home Rule to Ireland by a separate piece of parliamentary legislation is for the present abandoned, we trust that the suggestion that the Premier should receive a deputation of those who believe in Federalism as a solution of the problem not only of Irish, but also of Scottish, Welsh and English, Home Rule will receive full and mature consideration and bear rapid fruit. It has always seemed to us that federalism would bring the easiest, quickest, and happiest solution not only for the wrongs and troubles of Ireland, but also for the local autonomous aspirations of Ulster, Scotland, Wales, and even England. The difficulties in the way are two. *First* we have the passionate aspiration of the Irish to be allowed to settle their own political fate and fortune. So long as the Irish were not prepared

to allow others to take part in settling their affairs, federalism could not make way. It was for this reason that, when Mr. Gladstone became convinced of the necessity of granting Home Rule to Ireland, he proposed to remove the representation of Ireland in the Parliament at Westminster, so that if the Irish would have Home Rule at all costs and would not allow any others to share in any part of the government of Ireland, the Irish should have no share, too, in settling British or Imperial concerns. The wisdom of this policy was not recognised at the time, and has not been recognised since. The Irish, in order to gain Home Rule anyhow, agreed to the demand that the existing parliamentary representation should be continued in some form or other, but they have insisted on Home Rule without external interference in all matters purely and specifically Irish. *Secondly*, Federalism for the United Kingdom could not be settled without simultaneously taking into consideration the problem of Imperial Federation,—without the consideration of the claims of the Colonial Dominions of the Empire for a share in the settlement of the policy and the government of the Empire. But now conditions have changed a good deal. The Irish question, after more than thirty years of honest and sustained efforts at a settlement made by the Liberal party, has reached a condition which can only be described as one of insolubility,—of absolute *impasse*,—by whose fault we need not, for our present purpose, pause to inquire. Also, a great advance has been made, by means of Colonial and Imperial Conferences, towards giving to the Colonies and even India a share in the settlement of Imperial matters, and we may fairly hold that Imperial federation has made a great and notable advance and is in a fair way towards reaching a practical solution, and is no mere fad of a fanatic's heated brain or a purely Utopian dream. Now that these two difficulties are in a fair way of being removed, the case for federalism both for the United Kingdom and even for the Empire is bound to advance, and we already see signs of such advance in the Prime Minister's assent to the desire that he should receive a deputation of those who believe in Federalism as a solution of the Irish problem and crisis. We trust that Mr. Lloyd-George will be able to make a truly statesmanlike pronouncement, and one that will prove a real help towards making such progress in the cause as would satisfy popular opinion not only in Ireland and the United Kingdom, but throughout the Empire.

The chief objection to the federal method of solving the Irish question is that it reverses what seems to be acknowledged as the only natural order of political procedure and political development. There are those who claim that a state must be recognised as self-governing, and then only its citizens can acquire the power of divesting themselves of their powers in certain important matters and placing themselves under the control of the federal state in those matters. But Abraham Lincoln has said of America :—"The Union is older than any of the states, and in fact created them as states." An able American writer has also said :—"In a Federal state, its foundation rests in itself. It is created by the people as a whole, and the so-called individual states, or,

as we prefer to call them. "Commonwealths," are creations of its will. This is true whatever may have been the historical steps by which the Federal State may have been created. And again;—"The apparent continued existence in the Federal State of what were formerly independent political bodies is not real. Such bodies politic are destroyed when their citizens transfer their allegiance to the central power. *They are re-created as Commonwealths by the federal* constitution." If this is true even of a state which enjoyed self-government and freedom before the creation of the federal state into which it is incorporated, how much more is it true of a dependent commonwealth or possession like Ireland which obtains self-government for the first time simultaneously with, or subsequently to, its incorporation into a federal state,—and merely by reason of such incorporation.

Another difficulty has also to be dealt with. Would England allow equality of political status to Ireland, Scotland, Wales,—and also to Ulster, if it claims, as it will, to enter the Federal Union as a separate Commonwealth or state. In America, too, the same difficulty was felt. The great states would not share power equally with the smaller ones, and the small states were afraid of getting swamped by the vast numbers inhabiting the greater ones. Hence, the device was adopted of organising the representative chamber on the basis of population and the Upper Chamber or Senate on the basis of an equal number of senators for all commonwealths or states, great and small. Moreover, every citizen was made the subject of his own state and also of the federal government. The federal government had its powers enumerated, but they were capable of development, while the powers of the Commonwealths or states were also limited,—and thus each was made to act as a check on the other, while the development of which the Federal principle was capable has made America the freest, most prosperous, and most powerful community now existing in the world. The British Constitution must make America its model, if it is to satisfy the aspirations of the various communities now nestling under its wings and also to provide at the same time for their future progress and expansion.

All this argument assumes that there is recognised everywhere the need for a central organisation which is to control the subordinate members in all matters relating to foreign relations and other important affairs. Such a central organisation exists now for the British Empire in the British Parliament (and its creature the Cabinet). But in the new epoch of history upon which we are to enter after the war, the Colonial Dominions—and even India—will not be satisfied with a central organisation in which they have no recognised place. The British Parliament and Ministry are already recognising this difficulty and providing against it by means of frequent Imperial Conferences. We believe that federation has with it the pro-

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager. "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

mise and the potency of the future, and it is time that its difficulties are met and a scheme devised which will effectively deal with present needs and those which will prove immediately pressing so as to pave the way for a satisfactory Constitution of the British Empire of the future.

Notes and Comments.

It is indeed, astonishing that the War Cabinet should have resolved to abandon—or at least shelve for the present—the policy of Home Rule for Ireland. It has taken more than 30 years to bring the question of Irish Home Rule to its present maturity. Since Mr. Gladstone threw the weight of his supernatural powers and unprecedented influence with the British electorate into the cause of Irish freedom, the policy of Home Rule has made great and notable advances. This result was achieved chiefly by the labours of the later Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and his successor—Mr. Asquith,—in the leadership of the Liberal party, whose fearless statesmanship and skilful parliamentary strategy have everywhere won just admiration. Since Mr. Asquith's fall from power, numerous blunders have been made by his successor, and the failure now confronts us of the many fair hopes and fond anticipations of Irish freedom entertained all over the world. Mr. Lloyd George has in our view, been all that a British Minister ought not to be,—impulsive, eccentric, fickle-mind, weak, and easily led to a degree unexampled in living memory.

***

Heaven alone knows how India is going to fare under Mr. Lloyd-George. The case of Ireland is not at all re-assuring. Already the War Cabinet's treatment of the Home Rule Deputations has caused grievous disappointment in India. Also, the disappointment caused by its resolve to postpone the consideration of the Indian Reform question and simply to publish the schemes put forth by Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford has been great and universal. There are many who think—and not without justification—that this measure amounts practically to a shelving of Indian reform for the present,—*i.e*, for a fairly indefinite period. How long are these two schemes to be kept before the public for criticism in the press and the platform? What after all is to be gained thereby? The Cabinet knows what India wants, and the two most responsible of all Indian authorities have also placed before it their proposals and recommendations,—and they have made their suggestions after a prolonged investigation on the spot of the various currents of popular aspirations and sectional interests or opinions in the land. The Cabinet must, therefore, proceed to form its own judgment on the present situation and place it before the Parliament. That it should abdicate its functions just at this moment when all eyes are turned towards it in eager expectation is on a par with its Irish policy of shelving Home Rule, and shows its failure to grasp the situation.

***

We think that the London Correspondent of *The Hindu* has done well to inform us what public opinion in England thinks of Sir Subramania Iyer's letter to President Wilson. He says that "such unequivocal denunciations of British rule in the midst of the present crisis and addressed to the head of a foreign state are felt to be embarrassing by many whose devotion to India's cause cannot be questioned." We have already more than once expressed our opinion regarding Sir Subramania Iyer's so-called "appeal" to President Wilson. The language is strong, and therefore the *Hindu's* London Correspondent may be justified in calling it a "misplaced pronouncement." But the writer's aim is perfectly loyal, and this should be recognised by all. If Sir Subramania Iyer had asked for America's help, he would have certainly made himself open to condemnation, both in England and in India. He has only asked for sympathy, and that ought to free him from any charge of disaffection or disloyalty. We know that Sir Subramania Iyer is incapable of harbouring any such sentiments and there is no more loyal subject of Great Britain now

alive. Let us hope that the so-called "appeal" will be not too seriously treated and an importance attached to it which it by no means deserves.

*
* *

If Sir Subramania Iyer's letter to President Wilson was due to impulse rather than to calm reflection, his renunciation of the titles of K.C.I.E. and Dewan Bahadur is an act about whose unwisdom or impropriety there can be no two opinions. Those titles were conferred on him by Government for his services as a High Court Judge and as a revenue officer in the earlier phase of his career and before he became a lawyer. If the Secretary of State condemned his letter to President Wilson, why should Sir Subramania Iyer's wrath be roused against these decorations which have no sort of connection with his political career or opinions? If Sir Subramania Iyer had never accepted these titles from Government, then the world would have regarded him as a man who had the magnanimity to rise above life's petty ambitions and purely personal aims. But he retained them and enjoyed the self-esteem and social esteem which titles are calculated to rouse to the present advanced period of his age, and so he ought to keep them to the last. Sir Subramania Iyer may think he has done something meritorious in getting rid of these titles. But we fear that most of our countrymen—at least the more thoughtful of us—will regard it as no sacrifice at all, but will ascribe it to a kind of thoughtless and sudden impulse to which tropical men are more or less liable especially among a race of degenerate men like the Brahmins of to-day. Or they will be forcibly reminded of the story of சொழியன் குண்டு, the Soliya Brahmin's tuft of hair in front which has passed into a proverb.

*
* *

Do our readers know what this story is? We will give it as related to us in boyhood by a school-and-play-mate of ours, somewhat senior to us in years. A Mohammedan captain who captured a fort near Trichinopoly asked for orders from his general how to dispose of a number of Hindu prisoners whom he had captured in war and kept in confinement. The general, in directing him to set the prisoners free, insisted that each should suffer some injury to a limb. The captain set out to put the order into execution. There was much wailing and gnashing of teeth as each prisoner issued out of the fort and had one or other of his limbs cut off. Among the prisoners thus inhumanly treated was a Soliya Brahman with his tuft of hair in the front of his head. When his turn came to appear before the Captain, he took hold of his tuft of hair in front and besought him, in loud and querulous tones, to spare his tuft of hair which, he declared, was more valuable and sacred than any of the limbs of his body. The Captain, on hearing this, ordered the soldiers on duty to cut off the tuft of hair at once and let him go. So the clever Soliya Brahmin escaped immolation of any of his limbs. The moral of the story is obvious, and we do not intend to apply it.

*
* *

The disappearance of Mr. Welby from Madras journalism is an event of some importance. We certainly welcome it, for the *Madras Mail* has always, before Mr. Welby took it up, been edited by gentlemen who did not fail to recognise the sterling worth and genuineness of Indian public life and public men in Madras. Virulent Anglo-Indian dislike of things Indian in general, and of Indian political progress in particular, has always been conspicuous by its absence in Madras, and we have ever been thankful for the moderation which has characterised the opinions and writings on current topics of leaders of Anglo-Indian journalism in Madras like Lawson and Beauchamp. Mr. Welby might, or might not, have possessed the journalistic fire. Men have often indulged in extravagant laudation of his style of writing. But we think the function of a journalist is, above all things, to criticise and oppose the measures of Government where it goes wrong, to secure public appreciation where it promotes the public interest, and generally to promote social harmony and progress. But Mr. Welby failed to do just these things, and hence was not what a Madras Anglo-Indian

journalist ought to have been. We trust that those who are responsible for the future policy and conduct of the *Madras Mail* will return to the saner and more liberal policy so long maintained by Mr. Welby's predecessors and so fruitful of peace and good-will among the Anglo-Indian and Indian Communities.

Olla Podrida.

The human ogres called Examiners of The Madras University have had their fill of innocent blood. Irrespective of the victims the lucky innocents have gaily assembled in schools and colleges unmindful of their postponed doom. The list of the eligibles is a brief one because though many are called few are chosen. The eligibles have come up bravely to have their brain-cases crammed full of useless matter and their great expectations are sure to be amply fulfilled. Some of them —the specially elect—are going to be Hons. Why do people delight in these appreciations, I wonder ? The abbreviated is sometimes bigger than the unabbreviated. Many men are honcurable but only very few are Hon'bles. Many—nay, most of us—are companions—very loving and affectionate companions—of the Indian Empire—but only few persons, many of them not real well-wishers of our land, are C.I.Es. This is a wonderful thing indeed proving conclusively that the part is greater than the whole. By the bye, we had our little scheme of revenge in our gala days. There was a gentleman who was the chief sanitary inspector of Kumbakonam. We called him K.C.S.I. I am giving this information privately. Please do not make it public because the King-Emperor is the only fountain of honour and our youthful audacity may be regarded as *lese majestic.*

***

I have been digressing. Hons. or no Hons. the poor things are, thanks to our folly and shortsightedness, being ruined physically and mentally. Piling Pelion on Ossa in the shape of notebooks on books, they waste their youth and manhood "with blinded eyesight poring over miserable books." They know less than nothing about the world of nature and the spiritual world. They begin to breathe the air of contentiousness and hate even in the temples of learning. They have no knowledge of our languages and ideals and have a fine contempt for the few dedicated spirits who spend many years over such neglected branches of study. Their study of English no doubt brings them money which combines in itself the virtues of the apple of discord and the dead sea fruit. The spacious leisure and the self-poised rapture of our older life are gone, gone for ever.

***

The same issues of our daily papers brought us news of Mr. Lloyd-George's speech that Ireland must be free to give the glad and willing and grateful and efficient help of free men to the great cause and the decision of the Government to drop both self-government and conscription in Ireland. I am no politician, thank God. But what an irony of fate is this that two pages of the same paper should flourish two different ideals in our faces !

***

Mr. G. S. A. has begun his musings again. This time he has gone into wonderful moods of reverie in regard to the innocents (abroad or at home ?) After having achieved great things for India—national education, social service, students' conventions, etc. etc. etc.—it is but natural that he should contemplate his work on the seventh day and see that it is good, be glad......How long is this golden mood of reverie to last ?

***

The *Dharmika Brahmana Sangham* has made a momentous announcement on *New India* on 25th June 1918. It is going to open a list of widowers, widows, eligible bridegrooms of all castes and complexions and grown up girls who have attained

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,

For 50 copies Rs. 10 only.

puberty. It will be glad to cast the pawns about on the chessboard of Indian life. The only persons whose names are prescribed are young girls. If Sita were here now she would apply in vain for entering her name in the great matrimonial register. Poor Sita! What do we care for her provided the *sangham* flourisheth like the green bay tree.

SCRUTATOR.

Social Cosmos and its Key.

[BY N. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR M.A.]

In all matters there are three things:—starting point, goal and plan of action. The subject of social repairs or reconstruction can be no exception.

Now in regard to this subject, the starting point is the same for all people living at a particular age. Taking the age in which we are now living as the starting point, our present state is a state of struggling for self as against other selves, of serving oneself as against others, and of making one's own livelihood the chief point, even though it may be at the expense of others' interests. All these of course, are different ways of expressing the same thing.

In regard to goal we have none at all in the sense of an idea of a perfect state to attain and remain in. We even think that such an idea of perfect stationary state is absurd.

With no goal in view, there can be obviously no plan of action. But there must be *some* action for, man cannot be doing nothing. What he is doing or at least is trying to do, say in India now, is to struggle to exist as well as one may without recognising either the rights of others to particular functions and means of livelihood which we have conceded in the past by long established custom or our duty to others with reference to them. Not only India, but the whole world, has been, under the example and guidance of the West, moving in that direction. Now, what has been the result? Can we say that we are steadily approaching, though however much slowly, the canonical ideals of "peace on earth and good will among men"? Are not barbarity and treachery in such marked evidence on the part of some of the so-called civilised Governments and nations? Do we not see or rather groan under social, economic, religious and political unrest all the world over? Are not the extinction of nations and substitution of other nations in their place, famines, plagues, vices, crimes and great disease-mortalities, especially among the weaker nations becoming matters for record in history? May not the outlook be more hopeful if all rational men in responsible positions would set before themselves a goal? Would not then a plan of action follow? And with a plan of action, need we remain the helpless victim of chance? In other words, can we not assume our results? Even *a priori* speaking *i.e.*, arguing out what ought to be and may be rationally anticipated *i.e.*, apart from the teaching of painful experience suffered under blind necessity and without discrimination as to causes and effects, we must have a goal for every rational activity.

Now the goal of the Varnasramist or the neo-sociologist is to replace the struggle for self as against other selves by struggle for self through other selves; to replace the struggle to serve oneself as against others by struggle to serve oneself through serving others; to replace the making of one's own livelihood as the chief objective even though it may be at the expense of others' interest, by the making of the service of others, the means by which livelihood can be happily and strugglelessly secured. In other words, the Varnasramic goal is social cosmos. If the starting point *viz.*, to struggle to exist as best as one may, without recognising the rights of others or our duty to others is but another name for social chaos, the goal can only be the reverse *i.e.*, social cosmos under which each family will have a duty to serve society through one occupation and a right to livelihood through that occupation and through that only. In fact, if the demand for every service is kept at its proper level, no one will omit to do *his* duty, nor will any commit any infringement on the rights of *others*. This is the goal which the Varnasrama-dharmist

wants every human society to attain and remain in.

With a starting point and goal both settled and agreed on, a real plan of action it is quite possible to have. What is that plan is the next question. Before we answer it with reference to our own country, let us ask ourselves whether Indian society is now moving *towards* the goal or *away from* it. We see people struggling to live through particular occupations. They find that the conditions are so unbearable that they are unable to continue in their family occupations. They have either begun to leave them, or will soon begin to leave. Then, they *have* to encroach on the occupations of others. The 'law of civil protection' no doubt ensures a man's right to enjoy the property held by his father. But there is no corresponding law of economic protection under which he will have a right to enjoy the source of his father's property *i.e.*, his father's labour or means of livelihood. The result in society is a regular free fight for the means of obtaining food. In regard to these people who have begun to encroach on others' labour we have to consider them as moving away from the goal. What has got to be done with them is to make their respective occupations worth their while. For that purpose, the motto ought to be "buy of their produce more largely, invest more generously and export with a greater sense of responsibility."

There are also some people who have had long strayed from their old occupations and are now almost fixed in certain others. In regard to them, what has to be done is to concede the right to do what they are doing, but also affirm their *duty* to do it and the *responsibility* to do it *well*. These people must be taken as people who are moving towards the goal, the goal being responsible particularity of occupation. In both cases however the plan of action is to buy, invest and export *i.e.*, to buy yourself, get other nations to buy it without prejudice to their own labours and to invest our savings with our producing classes. This principle of buying, investing and exporting is the principle accepted by all civilised nations and is thoroughly sound. But a nation is said to misuse this principle when it buys other people's goods at the cost of its own people, exports at the cost of the people of the country to which the export is made and invests with other nations to the neglect of the interest of its own people. This is the misuse of intra-national and international commerce generally. The Varnasrama Dharma pleads for its right use.

To conclude, labour is of two kinds:—physical and mental. The division of labour in all societies must take note of both these. In a society where such note is taken order and efficiency are secured in respect of both, and all the ends of man—both this worldly and other worldly, are secured automatically and as a necessary consequence. Thus, it will be seen that neither is the goal of the Varnasramist unsound nor is his plan of action revolutionary. It makes for order and contentment which are the foundations of loyalty and good citizenship, more than any other. As for the terms 'progress' and 'reaction,' they have no meaning except with reference to a goal, and now with an accepted goal for social activity every act or omission, individual or collective, must be adjudged 'progressive' or 'reactionary' only according as it helps or hinders the attainment of that goal.

Dharma—VII.

By K. G. Natesa Sastri, Vaidya Visarad.)

Let us now turn to our topic and try to learn how the Buddhists meet the query of the mimamsakas in regard to their standard of a Pramana. The learned Parthasarathi Misra enunciates their method of interpretation in the following terms. "न हि ज्ञानमुत्पन्नमित्येतावतार्थतथात्वावधारणं युक्तं ; व्यभिचारादनिश्चयाच्च, अप्रामाण्यमेव तस्यां वेलायां प्राप्तम्" इति। The passage means: "one should not arrive at a conclusion hastily simply because a knowledge has been imparted to us by a Pramana, because that knowledge sometimes misleads and hence we cannot be certain of the results: What then? We must hold therefore that that knowledge is not competent to give us any definite conclusions at its birth." Let us try to understand this at some length.

We have already shown that, according to the Buddhists *Apramanya* is not "a thing which is cognizable" and therefore it requires no proof to maintain itself at the outset; while प्रामाण्य is वस्तु or "which is cognizable" and therefore it must be proved whether what we perceive is real, वस्तु or the reverse of it. In other words, अप्रामाण्य is nothing but "प्रामाण्याभाव" which means "validity negatived". Now "अभाव" or "Negtion" is "तुच्छ" or "nothingness" which cannot be perceived either by the senses or the mind. If it were a "वस्तु" but only different from another sort of "वस्तु" called "भाव" then we will have to accept both of them as objects or things which can be known, the only difference being that they are two separate things. In that case this "अभाव" cannot in any way be able to negative what is valid for both of them are two separate things having no connection whatever; the existence of a jar cannot invalidate or negative the existence of a "पट" or cloth; 'न हि घटे सति पटस्यानुपलब्धिः" for both of them are two separate things having no connection whatever between them. "If it is contended that because अभाव is भावविरोधि what means that अभाव is the reverse of what is भाव and therefore one can invalidate the other" the buddhists ask whether this "Virodha" or opposition affects the other or भाव in any way or not? for there may be, and are, things in the world, which though they may be opposed to one another, yet remain passive without affecting the other. If it remains passive then how can "अभाव" become विरोधि or antagonistic of भाव and hence it is idle to declare that "अभाव" negatives "भाव". If, on the other hand, it is accepted as affecting the other "भाव", then we ask "in what way?" This विरोध contained in "अभाव" ("*Abhava*") cannot create भाव ("*Bhava*") by its power of opposition. If it does then only we may legitimately fear of some material change. If this is not the case but only something else is produced then we come to the same point discussed before that "अभाव" though opposed to "भाव" cannot negative its validity because it does not and cannot materially affect it. All these stupidities arise out of accepting "*Abhava*" as a "वस्तु". Hence we conclude that "*Abhava*" is not "वस्तु" but "तुच्छ" nothingness, which means zero. "तस्मात् घटाभाव इति घटस्य भावो नास्तीत्यर्थः" So they put, which means "what we mean by "*Ghatabhava*" is that there is no "*Ghata*" "घट". Hence we conclude that *Apramanya* means "non-existence of what is known as *Pramanya*" or प्रामाण्याभाव and as अभाव is not a वस्तु it cannot arise from any object and as it cannot arise from anything there is no necessity for it to be demonstrated elaborately. In other words it exists at the outset, while "*Pramanya*" being वस्तु must arise out of something. Ramakrishna, in his commentary on the "Sastra Dipika" puts this contention of the Buddhists thus, "अप्रामाण्यं नाम प्रामाण्याभवः, तस्या वस्तुत्वात् न कुतश्चिदुत्पादः, प्रामाण्यं तु वस्तुत्वात् कारणगुणजन्यम्" The Mimamsaka now turns and again asks the buddhists what these exceptional merits are which go to make a *Pramanya valid*. To this they reply, that all *Pramanas* become *valid* on account of the instruments which are nothing but our senses, being pure and unblemished. In the case of "*Pratyaksha*" or actual perception if the sensory nerves are free from disease they convey impressions to the brain which do not in the least have a chance of failure; if they are diseased they mislead and produce all sorts of false impressions which are taken for real ones. The same is the case with *Anumana* also. Only a man with a clear brain and healthy nerves can deduce correct conclusions from given premises. In the case of words, the purity of purpose of the man who utters those words is the merit or jnana which makes his words *valid* while attempts at deceits etc., are faults which make them invalid. Therefore we hold that Pramanya is that which makes decisions from known things and hence it is that we maintain that प्रामाण्य is of the nature of a वस्तु which of necessity, must emanate from merits which the प्रमाण should possess. If, as the mimamsakas hold, *Pramanya* becomes of itself at the outset, then *Apramanya* also must be held to be such as it has been shown to be independent of anything else. In that case, all sorts of knowledge must be held to be *Pramanas*. Even the phantoms of a dream become real then,

because it also gives a knowledge which has the ability to penetrate into our hearts or बोधकत्व: as it is called. The mimamsaka next asks "How can *Apramanya* be held not to emanate from anything; because we actually see that it arises out of the diseased condition of the sensory and other nerves which are the channels of knowledge. A man suffering from jaundice sees everything as yellow, while on recovery he perceives it in in its real colour. "कामली हि पीतं शंखं जानाति, तदपगमे च शुक्लम् "and hence it must be admitted that though *Apramanya* may be held to be "अवस्तु" yet we must recognise that it arises and disappears according as our senses are diseased and healthy respectively. If this is not admitted then phantoms of dream will become *Pramana* even in your case also. To this the Buddhists reply that the diseased condition of the senses does not *produce Apramanya* but it exhausts itself in obstructing the rise of merits or guna which is the important factor in making a *Pramana* valid. In other words, when the right channels of knowledge are diseased the merits or gunas, which are not at the time, having been obstructed by the faults of the senses, do not generate the *Pramana* which is their function. And hence triumphantly conclude the Buddhists thus:— "तस्मात् कारण शुद्धत्वं ज्ञानप्रामाण्यकारणं । स्वभावतोऽप्रमाणत्वं तदभावे न लक्ष्यते" इति । which means for a *Pramana* to become valid its source must have merits. *Apramana* becomes of itself because it is *Abhava* and *Abhava* requires not a merit. To sum up the Vedas on which rests the *Chodana* of the mimamsakas have not been proved to be at a pure origin and hence they cannot be held as Pramanas. In the next article we shall see the reply of the mimamsakas.

Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore as a Maker of New India.

BY K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.

(continued)

In regard to the making of New India the first lesson that Tagore enforces with all the persuasive power of his genius is the uttermost need for Indians to be proud of what they are. He is never weary of asking us to take our stand upon our essential manhood and look other civilisations in the face with a true consciousness of the value of the Indian civilisation to the world. At the same time he is for a large measure of wise borrowing from the great stock of civilising and refining ideas which other nations have acquired for themselves and contributed to the common stock of human well-being. In the realms of science, commerce, and administration we have to acquire a great deal from our western brethren, but we must in the case of each acquisition not merely adopt the forms of western life but insist upon those forms wearing an Indian livery and submit to the law of naturalisation in the domain of Indian ideas. He says: "Thus placed between two contending forces we shall mark out the middle path of truth in our national life. We shall realise that only through the development of racial individuality can we truly attain to universality, can we perfect individuality; we shall know of a variety that it is ideal mendicancy to discard our own and beg for the foreign and at the same time we shall feel that it is the extreme abjectness of poverty to dwarf ourselves by rejecting the foreign." In his great address in Japan he has pointed out how that wonderful land is old and new at the same time and has maintained her individuality while attaining the new forms and instruments of power and has preserved her immemorial spiritual possessions. He says: "She has her legacy of ancient culture from the East—the culture which enjoins man to look for his true wealth and power in his inner soul, the culture that gives self-possession in the face of loss and danger, self-sacrifice without counting the cost or hoping for gain, defiance of death, acceptance of countless social obligations coming to man as a social being, the culture that has given us the vision of the infinite in all finite things. And Japan, the child of the ancient East, has also fearlessly claimed all the gifts of the modern age for herself. Thus she has come in contact with the living time and has accepted with an amazing eagerness and aptitude the responsibilities of modern civilisation. This it is that has given heart to the rest of Asia." Thus Tagore's view is that our duty is to have a clear, ceaseless, and proud vision of the unity and greatness of India and a boundless devotion to her ideals and to add to the eternal graces of India's

soul new accomplishments in the realm of material achievement. For this he has always held and acted upon the view that education is the sole lever of India's uplift. He has always had a high conception of the function of a teacher as the noblest and highest of possible work for a man and he has sought to realise it in his own individual life. In his Bolpur School and in his Vichitra hall he has sought to develop in a proper manner the scientific and artistic potentialities of the Indian mind; and upon the springing up of the innumerable educational institutions of the type of Tagore's school depends the making of a great New India which he has described for us in prose and song and has worked for with an unfaltering vision amid the varied noises and distractions of life in modern India. Our study of Tagore's conception of education which has according to him such a supreme place in the making of New India naturally leads us to the wider subject of literature and art. The wonderful power of the Indian vernaculars as vehicles of the highest human thought and emotion has been realised and demonstrated by him in the course of nearly three decades of incessant literary production. And every great vernacular has to take heart from this great achievement of Tagore. He has carried forward the great traditions of Indian poesy in its faithful conception of that holy wedlock of word and idea before the altar of beauty which is expressed by the Sanskrit word RASA, of the importance of perfect serenity of mood in relation to the ever recurring and the ever varying pains and pleasures of life, and of the supreme need of that elation of soul which is the result of the realisation of man's essential and inalienable union with the divine. In an age when there is a clash of ideals in literature and in life and when the din of conflicting notions as to the ideals and methods of literary expression is at its loudest, it is a matter for congratulation that the greatest poet of the day has thought it is his duty and privilege to be in the fullest touch with the greatest ideas of the Indian poets of the past ages and to make his mind a golden flute for the spirit of Indian poesy to fill with the music of India's soul. He has not made himself a mere echo of the western fashions but had all through his life sought inspiration from poets like CHANDI DASS and VIDYAPATHI, and saints and devotees like CHATAINYA AND KABIR. Thus both by precept and example he has shown in what direction lies the literary salvation of New India. He has realised, however, that true national uplift of any kind will be impossible without the writing of a proper Indian History by Indians themselves. He shows how in every country in the writing of history by even the most sympathetic outsiders there is a tendency to attach more importance to the incessant wars and dynastic changes than to the development of the people in the fields of life and art, of internal growth and sovereignty. He says: "But to a foreign traveller these storms are the most noticeable affair; everything else is hidden from him by the clouds of dust because he is not within our house but outside it. Hence it is that the histories of India written by foreigners tell us only of this dust, this storm and not of our home,—Indian history has concealed the true India——This history has, as it were, slipped the true Holy Book of India within a volume of the marvellous Arabian Nights' Tales. Our boys learn by rote every line of this Arabian Nights but none opens the sacred volume of India's inner history."

Tagore has shown to us that great personal qualities must be possessed by the men and women of India if they want to realise the dream of making India great and prosperous and happy in the future. The truest wealth of every country consists of its men and women and if we are poor in these highest forms of wealth the fulness and affluence of all other forms of wealth can never make up for our poverty in this direction. Tagore in his poems, as well as in his prose writings, insists on the preservation of that perfect combination of purity and piety which was characteristic of the highest types of the Indian people and he shows us that every form of individual and national prosperity is really dependent upon such an attitude towards life. One of the finest poems in the Gitanjali gives us a true insight into Tagore's ideas. This is my prayer to thee, "my Lord—strike, strike at the root of penury in my heart. Give me the strength lightly to bear my joys and sorrows. Give me the strength to make my love fruitful in service. Give me the

strength never to disown the poor or bend my knees before insolent might. Give me the strength to raise my mind high above daily trifles. And give me the strength to surrender my strength to Thy will with love." (The *Gitanjali*).

In this poem Tagore shows to us all the highest elements of India's outlook upon life. It is a combination of strength held in reserve with the devotion of the practical energies of life to the service of God.

Tagore has laid stress upon the need for many-sided social service. Even in the Bolpur school there is an attempt made to lead the boys into the paths of social service by inducing them to impart to the uneducated country lads around the place the blessings of education which they recieve in that model institution. It is only when the instinct of social service is cultivated early in the hearts of men that there will be a real and vital feeling of brotherhood which will make itself felt amid the inevitable shams and hatreds of life, because desire for the good things of the earth and love of enjoyment are sure to kill our higher nature and call into existence the baser passions in the course of adult life. In one of his stories, called "THE RESOLVED ACCOMPLISHED" he shows that the primary need of the time is industrial improvement which will be more practically effected by starting new industries in the truest spirit of social service than by frequent conferences which begin nowhere and end nowhere. This is a lesson which many of the sons of India who are fired by true patriotism have to learn and ponder over—a lesson to confer less and serve more. In regard to social ideals Tagore while recognising generally that the Indian social system has provided the best basis for social harmony seems to hold the view that there must be new social re-adjustments in the direction of social equality. But a proper study of the past history of India shows to us that social harmony and national efficiency of the highest order can be broad-based upon the scheme of Hindu life as laid down in the Scriptures and realised in ancient times in India. In regard to the conception of marital duty and felicity Tagore has depicted in his *Chitra* the essential beauty and attractiveness of the system of marriage which is based upon the kinship of soul rather than upon the mere attraction of physical loveliness.

(*To be continued.*)

HINDU MESSAGE

VOL. I.

OCTOBER 1917—APRIL 1918.

Bound in Cloth Price **Rs. 3** only.

Postage Extra.

Gleanings.

The Rishikul—A National Institution.

Few places even in this our most beautiful and holy land can claim precedence over Haridwar, where amidst the hills that protect it carefully from external contamination the divine Ganga, yet in her infancy, crisps wildly yet not furiously. It is a place fashioned by Nature for purity and quietitude, wherefore from time immemorial it has been the beloved haunt of *yogins* and *sanyasins*—of those who wish to devote themselves to serene meditation. The hillsides are clothed with dense green vegetation, which stands in charming contrast with the white waters of the holy Ganges. Even here the unhallowed impudence and philistinism of modern mechanics has made its inroad and has set up its impious damning appliances. How I wish that mother Ganga would rise up one day in indignant fury and sweep aside everything that dare obstruct her unfettered course. Yet on the whole the holiness of the atmosphere and the purity of the place are still immaculate, and attract thousands of pilgrims from all parts of the country.

Blessed were they who thought that here at least Sanatana Dharma should find a stronghold capable of resisting the many corrupting influences of the modern money-making pleasure-craving world of shopkeepers. Our ancient educational ideals have almost entirely disappeared from the land, and been replaced by the barbarous commercial systems of the West. Boys are now-a-days sent to schools and colleges to be trained to become efficient wage-earners. Our ancients did not ignore the arts of worldly wealth; but these were subordinated to the function of true Education—to the building of character, to the evolution of the divinity in man. Not efficiency but self-control, and through self-control the true knowledge that is power— this was our national ideal of Brahmacharya. The for-

getting of this ideal has been the prime cause of our national degradation.

The Rishikul at Haridwar is one of the few places where an attempt is made to practice this ancient ideal. It has now been in existence for about twelve years; it has thus survived the risks of infancy. But because we have fallen victims to the false ideals of Europe, it has not yet become, as it deserves to become, the chief University of India. We have here the old system of the pupils and their teachers living together, making one home as it were; we have here *Brahmacharya* practiced as of yore; we here have the daily *samidadhana* by the pupils; here we have the Vedas and the Vedangas taught to all Dwija boys that seek admittance there. No fees are charged whether for tuition or for boarding. The Europeanised shop-keeper has had no hand in the organisation of this institution. It is the Brahmana ideal that is maintained; and so we have no sale of knowledge, no bartoring of sacred learning. Besides teaching of our holy Scriptures and Sanskrit, instruction through the meduim of Hindui is imparted in various "modern" subjects, including English. In the college department there is specialisation in the various *Shastras* and *darshanas*.

The whole institution is maintained from public benefactions. It owns 300 bighas of land, about a mile from the Ry. station, situated on a huge channel of the Ganges. The buildings alone have cost over a lakh of rupees; and the funded property is over another lakh. This of course is hardly enough for the maintenance of the institution; and so this income is supplemented by donations large and small from the general public. There is no doubt that the Rishikul deserves the good-will and patronage of every true Hindu, of every follower of Sanatana Dharma. It is through such institutions our national salvation can ever come. There is a great deal of room for improvement. But does modern India truly realise the need for her ancient ideals? Or will she follow the short-sighted ways of those who will make machines of men, enchaining if not altogether destroying the Divinity within?

M. K. A. in *Indraprastha.*

The *Hindu* writes:—

His Highness the Maharajah of Mysore struck the right note in his reply to the Non-Brahmin Deputation which waited on him and presented an address yesterday. There is only one proper course to take for an impartial and sensible ruler or statesman in regard to this matter and we are glad to note that this was the course that was adopted by His Highness. The call went forth from a few Brahmanophobia-stricken individuals to "level down" those who, for no fault of their own and through "certain natural causes" as His Highness put it, rose to high positions in Government service; His Highness rightly declined to respond to that call. He outlined the policy of his Government in these words: "It is hardly necessary for me to say that it is far from my desire that any community should be penalised on account of its caste simply because it was the first to educate itself and to utilise fully the opportunities for advancement which are open to all my subjects. I believe that the Brahmin community is as loyal as any among my people nor can I forget the signal service rendered in the past and still being rendered to my house and State by members of that community. My aim is to pursue a just and righteous policy as between various castes and communities in the State; neither unduly favouring, nor suppressing any individual one, but trying to uplift them all for the permanent good of the State." This, we conceive, is the only right spirit in which the problem should be solved. It is a great travesty of truth to suggest that those who are fortunate— or is it unfortunate? —to belong to a particular forward community which happens to have a good and long record of efficient public service, who are as honourable and patriotic as any others in the State, are intent upon keeping other less forward communities depressed; and we are glad to be assured that persons in exalted position such as His Highness the Maharajah of Mysore will not shrink from stating the truth, however unpleasant and disappointing it may be to some of their auditors.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.